

College Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE ON
COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

EDITOR

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, *Purdue University*

EDITORIAL BOARD

FRANCIS E. BOWMAN, *Duke University*; LOUIS FORSDALE, *Teachers College, Columbia University*; W. NELSON FRANCIS, *Franklin and Marshall College*; STEWART S. MORGAN, *The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas*; PORTER G. PERRIN, *University of Washington*; SAMUEL WEINGARTEN, *Chicago City Junior College, Wright Branch*

PERIODICALS
OCT 24 1955
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Vol. IV	May, 1953	No. 2
THE DICTIONARY AS A GUIDE TO PRONUNCIATION— <i>Albert H. Marckwardt</i>		35
LITERATURE IN FRESHMAN ENGLISH— <i>Gerald H. Thorson</i>		38
AN ENGLISH COMPOSITION COURSE BUILT AROUND LINGUISTICS— <i>Donald J. Lloyd</i>		40
PROBLEMS OF MOTIVATION IN JUNIOR COLLEGE COMMUNICATION COURSES— <i>B. E. Fisher</i>		43
BUILDING A USABLE SPELLING LIST FOR CLASSES IN WRITING— <i>Paul R. Sullivan</i>		45
TEACHING EXPOSITION: A METHOD— <i>Howard Green</i>		48
A DEVICE FOR TEACHING DICTION— <i>Ralph Eberly</i>		52
SECRETARY'S REPORT No. 8— <i>Beverly E. Fisher</i>		53
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CCCC CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.....		54
SOME OF THE YEAR'S WORK IN COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION.....		56

College Composition and Communication is published quarterly in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter June 28, 1950, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to W. Wilbur Hatfield, 8110 South Halsted Street, Chicago 20, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to George S. Wykoff, University Hall, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

National Council of Teachers of English Conference on College Composition and Communication

1953 OFFICERS

KARL W. DYKEMA, Chairman
Youngstown College

T. A. BARNHART, Associate Chairman
State Teachers College, St. Cloud

JEROME W. ARCHER, Assistant Chairman
Marquette University

BEVERLY E. FISHER, Secretary
Santa Monica City College

W. WILBUR HATFIELD, Treasurer
8110 South Halsted St., Chicago

GEORGE S. WYKOFF, Editor
Purdue University

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Universities

HAROLD B. ALLEN, Minnesota

RICHARD S. BEAL, Boston Univ.

GEORGE P. FAUST, Kentucky

IRWIN GRIGGS, Temple

JOHN C. HODGES, Tennessee

GLENN H. LEGGETT, Washington

HENRY W. SAMS, Chicago

FRANCIS SHOEMAKER, Teachers College,
Columbia

MCDONALD WILLIAMS, Wilberforce

KARL YOUNG, Brigham Young

Liberal Arts Colleges

WAYNE C. BOOTH, Haverford

L. A. KING, Muskingum

STRANG LAWSON, Colgate

CARL LEFEVRE, Pace

JAMES H. MASON, Indian Springs School

SISTER MIRIAM JOSEPH, C.S.C., St. Mary's
(Indiana)

WATERS TURPIN, Morgan State

F. EARL WARD, Macalester

Teachers Colleges

PAUL W. BARRUS, East Texas State

WILLIAM T. BEAUCHAMP, Geneseo

JEAN MALMSTROM, Western Michigan
College of Education

KATHERINE SCOTT, Georgia State College
for Women

Technical Schools

HOWARD R. BARTLETT, Mass. Inst. Tech.

EMMA BEEKMAN, Los Angeles Trade and
Tech.

T. J. FARR, Tenn. Polytech. Inst.

HERBERT B. NELSON, Oregon State

ROBERT E. TUTTLE, General Motors Inst.

Junior Colleges

DONALD BIRD, Stephens

GLADYS BROWN, Little Rock

JOSIAH L. GEIST, Wright

GORDON MILLS, Los Angeles

MARGUERITE H. MOREY, Colby Jr.

The Dictionary as a Guide to Pronunciation¹

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT²

n For certain features of language, particularly matters of inflectional form and syntax, there are many different kinds of information about current use, both generally available and readily interpreted. For pronunciation there is but one—the dictionary. For just a little less than two hundred years, dictionaries have assumed the responsibility of presenting information about, and guidance in, matters of pronunciation. Samuel Johnson treated this topic somewhat casually, but in the quarter-century which followed the first appearance of his magnificent work, three pronouncing dictionaries of the English language were compiled. Since that time English lexicographers have regularly endeavored to furnish their public with positive aid in the matter of pronunciation.

This involves a number of difficulties which may easily lead to errors of interpretation and judgment, if they are not clearly recognized by those who consult dictionaries on questions of pronunciation. First of all there is the sheer magnitude of the task. Unabridged dictionaries today record approximately half a million words. English is a first or native language for no less than 225,000,000 speakers. According to their titles, many dictionaries claim to reflect the language practices of all or a large portion of this tremendous number.

Fortunately, not all speakers regularly use or pronounce the whole English word stock. If they did, the lexicographer would be faced with the stupendous task of representing or reflecting 112,500,-

000,000 individual word-pronunciations. By comparison even the national debt pales into insignificance. Seriously, however, this means that in collecting information about pronunciation, no dictionary can do more than sample the usage of a relatively small number of speakers for a relatively small proportion of the total English vocabulary. Anything beyond this would be so costly as to be totally impracticable.

The second major difficulty is that which faces the pronunciation editor when he tries to put into two-dimensional black and white, in a form simple enough to be interpreted by the average reader, a series of vocal noises which have at least three or four dimensions or attributes. In addition to its distinctive phonemic quality, the ordinary English speech sound also possesses the features of duration, stress, and pitch, not to mention the way in which it may be joined to neighboring sounds. Ideally, some clue ought to be furnished for all of these; practically this can be done only for a very limited audience, those who have been trained to interpret narrow phonetic transcription. The general-use dictionary must content itself with a very broad approximation to these complexities.

These, then, are two of the very practical and immediate problems which beset the editor of any pronouncing dictionary. He will, of course, approach his task conscientiously and do his best, but it would be a mistake not to realize that he is necessarily operating under limitations.

All lexicographers do not go about their business in precisely the same manner. Consequently, to interpret intelligently the information on pronuncia-

¹ Given at the panel discussion, "Sources of Information for the Establishment of Usage Standards," spring meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Cleveland, Ohio, March 29, 1952.

² University of Michigan

tion which is presented in a dictionary, the reader must be aware of the attitude toward several salient editorial problems which each particular dictionary reflects. First of all, what is the editor's conception of the function of a pronouncing dictionary? There is a world of difference between the concept implicit in such a title as *The Five Thousand Words Most Frequently Mispronounced* and the scientific attitude set forth in the second edition of Webster's *New International Dictionary* to the effect that "The function of a pronouncing dictionary is to record as far as possible the pronunciations prevailing in the best present usage, rather than to attempt to dictate what that usage should be." Fortunately, most current dictionaries have followed Webster in attempting to attain something like scientific objectivity, although possibly no one of them succeeds one hundred percent of the time.

This concept of dictionary function raises a further question. What is one to do about pronunciations which he knows to be in current use by cultivated speakers but which do not appear in the dictionary? Here again the answer is suggested by the Webster preface in the sentence immediately following the one quoted above. "In so far as a dictionary may be known and acknowledged as a faithful recorder and interpreter of such usage, so far and no farther may it be appealed to as an authority." In terms of a specific situation, this means that if the pronunciation of *data* with the vowel of *fat* is widely current among educated people and the dictionary does not record the pronunciation, that dictionary simply ceases to be an authority on that particular point. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the collective experience reflected by any dictionary is unquestionably greater than that of the individual observer; hence the dictionary may properly be assumed to be

correct until it is indisputably proved wrong. But this can happen.

It is also important to be aware of the speech situation which is reflected in dictionary pronunciations. Some dictionaries record the informal utterances of cultivated speakers, the language of well-bred ease; others select the language characteristic of decidedly more formal situations. For example, in ordinary conversation the final syllable of *evil* will consist of little more than a syllabic consonant, but on the lecture platform many speakers take great pains to pronounce the unstressed *i* with the vowel of *bit*; in fact, they may have to do this in order to be clearly understood. The most frequent misinterpretation of the dictionary in this connection is to attempt to apply to ordinary conversation the dicta which are intended for the pulpit and the lecture platform.

This also raises the interesting question of what dictionaries of the future will do about formal platform speech. The recent development of voice-amplifying mechanisms has rendered largely unnecessary many of the artificial emphases and distortions which were forced upon speakers of an earlier era in order to make their unamplified voices clear to large audiences. Presumably this change should be reflected by dictionaries now in the process of being edited.

A corollary matter is the question of whether pronunciations are to be recorded in isolation or as they occur in running context. Most of our speech is, of course, in running context; hence, a transcription of a word in isolation is in a sense an artificial abstraction. On the other hand, the influences of neighboring sounds and varying prosodic patterns upon a word are potentially so numerous as to place a severe burden upon the lexicographer if he tries to cover them all.

There is also the question of the regional form of speech which is to be represented. With English the first problem is a national one, the English of England or of America. Frequently the title of a dictionary will give a clue to its policy and coverage, as for example *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*, but more often the reader must consult the preface for information on this point. And once the national variety of the language has been determined, we are then faced with the question of which regional form is to be given priority. In general, American lexicographers have not in theory assumed that any one dialect was superior to another, but in actual practice, during most of the nineteenth century many concessions were made to New England pronunciations. It is probably fair to say that, even today, Southern pronunciations are not covered as fully and as conscientiously as other regional forms.

The difficulty of reducing sounds to a series of black and white marks has already been mentioned, and here the reader must learn precisely what the system of symbolization in his dictionary is intended to represent. A symbol may represent one and only one configuration of the organs of speech, as do for example the characters of the phonetic alphabet. Or, on the other hand, a dictionary symbol may signify a whole range of pronunciations, as does, for example, the Webster *â*, which is used in connection with the entire class of words of the *ask-path-calf* type, whose pronunciation ranges from the stressed vowel of *hat* to that of *art*. In the latter instance, these variant values are clearly set forth in the preface—that great no-man's land of the lexicographer—but they cannot be clearly comprehended by the hasty reader who consults only the running key at the bottom of the page. Similar multiple values are also frequent-

ly assigned by lexicographers to symbols representing the stressed vowels of words like *hot*, *bird*, and *new*. The multiple-value symbol has the advantage of economy; it runs the risk of misinterpretation.

Of course dictionaries frequently do indicate more than a single standard pronunciation for many words. Very often such words fall into well-defined groups posing certain common problems, as for example the variant stress on disyllabics like *robust* and *finance*. Again these may be taken up as a group in the introductory matter, and in the body of the dictionary the reader will simply be referred to the section of the preface where they are discussed, either by a paragraph number or other reference symbol, but this is precisely the kind of mechanism which the casual reader often misses.

There is a final question which is posed by variant pronunciations in the dictionary. Which of the several recommended forms is the consultant to employ? For many years there has been a superstition of decided preference adhering to the first pronunciation, but again a glance at the preface of a good dictionary will easily dispel this notion. The *Webster's Collegiate* tells us that "Each form entered, however, has the support of good usage, and in some cases this usage is nearly or quite equally divided." The *American College Dictionary* is even a little more forthright in its statement that "Any pronunciation in this dictionary is a good pronunciation and may be safely used. If the second or third pronunciation is your natural pronunciation, it is the one to use." Indeed a moment's reflection will make it plain that the number of informants from which pronunciations are collected is so small, and the number of speakers they represent is so vast, that a second body of information collected from an equal number of cultivated speakers

might quite completely reverse the evidence upon which the editor's final judgment has been based.

Admittedly the dictionary is not a perfect tool, but it is a useful one, and if employed intelligently can dispel much uncertainty, much anxiety, and many

wrong notions about pronunciation. In terms of the skill and science which go into their make-up, dictionaries are in all probability ahead of their market at the present time. They will improve only in response to the intelligent demands of their users.

Literature in Freshman English

GERALD H. THORSON¹

There is a definite need for the study of literature in Freshman English. At many of the colleges Freshman English is the only course in the English Department required for graduation. For many students it remains the only opportunity for contact with the poet or novelist. And with small-college deans and administrators eager for their students to make a good showing on the sophomore culture examinations, it becomes imperative to acquaint the freshmen with at least a few of the literary masterpieces. Furthermore, the study of literature can be used to good advantage in the teaching of basic communication.

The Freshman English course can help to acquaint students with the various authors, types, and methods of literature. Cannot the teacher, like Chaucer's eagle, lift the students up to the House of Fame? The student may not even get within the walls, but he can at least hear the rumors and names as they are whispered about the courtyard, and perhaps it will induce him to further study of these names later on.

Literature should be taught as literature, even in Freshman English. But to deny its value as a means of communication is to ignore one of the traditional sources of communication. The freshman too often comes to college ill-prepared in the humanities; and to offer him a steady

diet of editorials, business reports, and letters is to deny him the vast enjoyment he can derive from fiction, poetry, and drama. Not all people live in a world of newspapers, radio, and business reports alone; and if some do, the college should assist those in focusing their attention on that neglected aspect of communication: literature.

Through literature a Freshman English instructor can teach the methods of getting at what is communicated. Reading and understanding are valuable goals in communication: can we afford to ignore literature altogether? I have found the freshman's response much more alert and keen in the study of literature than in the study of editorials or essays. They are more interested in, more eager to express themselves on, *My Last Duchess*, for example, or *Anna Christie* than on *Radio Doesn't Entertain* or *Churchill True to Form*.

For most important of all, literature can be used to furnish ideas for class discussion and writing. And in that position it offers the teacher the best means of promoting more effective communication. It gives the student a worthwhile topic to think about, and it gives him practice in arranging his thoughts in a logical, clear, and interesting manner.

Let me illustrate by rehearsing my own experience. At Augsburg College we have a two-semester course in Freshman English giving six credits. This is

¹ Augsburg College

the only course in English required for graduation. The classes are sectioned according to the scores on the English Co-operative Examination directed by the University of Minnesota. Top students are put in English 3-4, the majority in English 1-2, and the low ones in 1+A-2, which meets five hours per week the first semester with three credits, covering more slowly the same material covered in 1-2. English 3-4 includes more literature and a little more writing.

During the first semester the students concentrate on exposition and argument. Editorials, essays, etc., are assigned not for emulation but to promote class discussion and to provide topics for themes. A total of 7,000 words is written during the term—in and out of the classroom. This includes a research paper and an autobiography. Definite dates are set for the themes.

In addition language is studied, with Perrin's presentation as a basis, but the main burden of the writing difficulties falls on the individual conferences.

In 1949-1950 I had two sections of English 3-4 and one section of 1-2 (plus a literature course and one in corrective writing). Classes were conducted informally, and there was much discussion. The general pattern was to deal with a topic orally and then to put it into writing. In addition to the class discussions there were oral reports, panel discussions, and debates.

Though most of the theme writing the second semester was expository, students were given an opportunity to try other types. As in the first semester, 7,000 words were required, but there was more leeway in topics, and the students were allowed to set their own deadlines for much of the writing. One paper had to be a long one—a research paper, a short story, etc.

Description and narration were discussed, but outside of one short descrip-

tive essay and one informal narrative, the students were allowed to decide for themselves whether or not they wished to do more of this type of writing. Blair and Gerber's *The College Anthology*, part II, furnished an excellent introduction to the study of literature. In addition two novels—*The Scarlet Letter* and *The Grapes of Wrath*—were read.

Again as before there were informal discussions, panel discussions, and oral reports. The students enjoyed talking about *Frankie and Johnny*, or *Crossing Brooklyn Ferry*, or *The Swan Song*. Probably the most lively discussions of the term were on Faulkner's *The Bear* and Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler*, though the excerpts from Chaucer's Prologue to *The Canterbury Tales* ran a close third. And what is more important, these readings and discussions resulted in better writing.

In addition there were group projects. To celebrate the centennial of *The Scarlet Letter* one group wrote its own dramatization of the novel and presented it in class. Another group did some research on Hawthorne's life and presented dramatic scenes from it on the stage. One group decided to present a one-act play. Another group took a theme in poetry and showed how it had been handled by different poets.

All of these projects, I felt, stimulated class interest, and in so doing, they helped the students to write better themes. The publication of some of the themes in mimeographed form added further impetus; and a short story contest sponsored by the college Writers Club spurred some freshmen into narrative attempts (an upperclassman won the contest).

There was no lack of interest, no need to wonder "what do we write about next?" The topics were there, and literature furnished the topics. Strangely enough, the students preferred the study

of literature to the "dry" factual prose of the first semester; and, as a group, the best themes of the year were written on *The Minister's Black Veil*. Literature was not dead: it was very much alive.

The prominence of literature in a Freshman English course will depend on the individual students in the class. What are their needs? But ultimately the suc-

cessful use of literature depends upon the teacher's approach and administration.

Literature cannot be included to the exclusion of the other forms of communication. But it can become a vital and integral part of a well rounded course of instruction. The students will profit by it. And they will even enjoy it.

An English Composition Course Built Around Linguistics¹

DONALD J. LLOYD²

To build an English Composition course around linguistics is to take as your subject-matter the English language as it has been revealed to us by modern language study. It is to take the English language as a social instrument expressing, conditioning, and itself conditioned by the society that uses it. It is to take the English language as a set of habits which, though common to a nation, resolve down to certain neurological sets in specific human beings. And it is to take the English language as an organized structure of structures which must be grasped in its own terms or missed.

Now if this seems like a large slice of matter, let us remember that it is all being used to fill a course which has sought its subject-matter in the past from anthropology to Marxism and Psychoanalysis, and on through vertebrate and invertebrate zoology, and hence is frequently charged with having no subject-matter of its own at all.

Linguistics as a science is of respect-

able age, but its practical application to pedagogy in this country has been limited. It has been applied to the teaching of foreign languages to native Americans and it has been applied in a few places to the teaching of English to foreigners; but we who teach English to native Americans have chosen to light our candle at other flames. I am sorry to say that our candle sputters at both ends and gives a fitful light. To try to teach command of any language to anybody at any level without assimilating the findings of those who spend themselves professionally defining the nature of what is to be taught is to light a very tiny candle in a very dark and windy world.

I think that almost any of us, when he turns from the pat regularities of the handbooks to the published findings of language scholars, is dismayed by what he finds. In all the vast literature of linguistics, there is almost nothing directed to the teacher of English or designed to serve his needs; and even what little seems—at least from the preface—to be aimed at him is shrouded from him in the expression itself. Either it is couched in a symbolism and a jargon that looks like the higher mathematics of Lower Slobbovia, or else the terms that he is fa-

¹ Given at the panel discussion, "Building the Freshman Course on a Single Body of Subject Matter," spring meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Cleveland, Ohio, March 29, 1952.

² Wayne University

miliar with from his literary studies seem to have been given a slight tilt, so that their meaning has been subtly changed, and he finds himself unprovided with a tilt to match. It is a gruesome prospect.

And a brutal one. For he soon finds that he cannot depend upon the linguists to do much to help him. Unless they are themselves teachers of English they do not understand his problems; and in any event they are intent upon their proper business of analyzing language. They are concerned with the symmetry, the conciseness, the order of their description; they are anxious about its reflection of fact; but their published works are cabalistic communications with each other, and they do not seem to care whether he understands them or not. It is a brutal prospect. The English teacher cannot ask the linguists to come to him and explain themselves in his terms—for the most part they have forgotten, if indeed they ever knew, what his terms are. He has to go to them. He has to sit himself down and master this strange science if he is ever to make any use of it, master it by hard reading, expeditions to linguistic institutes, and by courses when he can find them.

Furthermore, this is a developing science in a period of extreme refinement; before we have taken the measure of yesterday's findings we have in our hands a mass of new information whose meaning the investigator himself—let alone anyone else—is only beginning to grasp. A statement made in full faith is often outmoded before it can be set up in type, but too late to be recalled. Linguists have only loose contact with each other; hence they are not always fully informed beyond their own close fields, and can be as spiteful, scornful, and incredulous as any outsider.

In spite of all this, the matter is there for inclusion in the composition course

and for drastic correction of the methods used in the course. Its net effect is to tip our presuppositions upside down.

What happens to usage? If you rest your exposition of American English on the Leonard-Marckwardt-Walcott studies, you come to feel that opinion about usage, however well-informed it seems to be, is a shaky reed to lean on. You go then to dialect materials and to the records of the *Linguistic Atlas*, and you find that both geographical and social variations are of an extreme delicacy, and that prestige items differ from town to town and from region to region. "If you ask me what is correct," says Raven McDavid, "I have to ask, for whom? Where? When?" Your immutable division between right and wrong dissolves into a spectrum of myriad social variations, and you become cautious about deciding that what is unfamiliar to you must therefore be "bad English." You discover that the standard language is a rapidly changing form adjusting to the needs of people of affairs, and that dialects you have grown up to despise are rooted in respectable antiquity and still reflect the vicissitudes of pioneer life. If you respect American traditions, you find these traditions best embodied in the language of the illiterate back-country farm families, whether they still stand on their own land or congeal in uneasy clots in our industrial cities. You come therefore to describe with respect. You give information; you do not devise new decalogues.

What happens to grammar? The linguist provides you with an analysis of English structure, laid out in levels, each of which is a constituent of the next: its phonetics, its phonemic system, its morphemes, and its syntax, all strict and elegant as mathematical formulae. But at what point do we cut into this to serve our needs? And what kind of language are we going to use to talk about it? We

have to learn this matter from the linguist in one language, one very hard for us to get hold of; into what terms do we translate? A great deal of it is not relevant to our practical needs; how do we pick out what is? Let me say here that I have resolved for myself a good part of this problem; after heaving the traditional grammar out of my courses as bootless, I have been gradually working out a way to use English structure to solve basic problems of reading and writing—solve them quickly and effectively. I have become a convinced and systematic grammarian.

What happens to our approach to our students? Well, quite a reversal. Each comes into class with his own idiolect. An idiolect, I may say, is one person's language. It is the raw material of linguistic study. From evidence that we draw from individuals, we describe the language habits of groups, because language has no real existence except in the habits of individuals. Thus the student is a walking fund of knowledge on which we draw, and as we teach him we learn from him. Taking him as possessing a matured set of habits—a system of habits—we approach him on the basis of what is now known about habit formation—especially the formation of language habits among people who form a community and meet face to face. If we find anything we have to change in the language of the student—and we do—we know that we are touching something that goes deep into his past and spreads wide in his personal life. We will seek not to dislodge one habit in favor of another but to provide alternative choices for freer social mobility. We seek to enrich, not to correct. We deal on the table with our students; we confide in them; we enlist them as colleagues in a common enterprise. By respecting their traditions and the people from whom they come, we teach them to respect and to hold

tight what they have as they reach for more.

Most important to me, I think, has been the way linguistics has helped me to rethink many of the common practices of English courses. Students by and large, you know, dislike English and they dislike English teachers. They think we are futile, trivial, unscientific, and out of touch with everything that has happened since Dewey took Manila. While they are being jerked out of our classes to take mountains in Korea, we are trying to make mountains out of such molehills as apostrophes. They can't figure out what in the world makes us tick, and by the time they get into college they pretty well don't care. Now of course this is their fault. But still, linguistics lets us look with a critical eye at some of the things we do.

It gives us a measure by which we can test every move we make in the classroom, by asking ourselves whether it is in keeping with the nature and structure of our language and in keeping with the nature of language habits. Perhaps it is most useful in what it tells us not to do, because, while to do the right thing *may* get us somewhere, to do the wrong thing is certainly futile. It brings us to the point where we would rather do nothing than do the wrong thing; when some impulses strike us as they do all English teachers, we learn to sit quietly counting until the impulses go away. It shows up the carping and nagging traditionally associated with us for what they are; it points up our bad manners—they are futile in teaching. It turns a pitiless light on our professional ignorance—it sends us to the experts. It makes it impossible for us to hide behind other men's workbooks. It makes us work out of class to become informed, and then it makes us go into the class and work while we are there—but with our students, not on them.

I think I shall repeat what I have said elsewhere: this is a promised land for the English teacher. Linguistics gives us a vision of the language which, taken into the classroom, makes it a happy, fruitful, and meaningful subject for teacher

and student. I don't know about you, but if my class had been happy, fruitful, and meaningful before I learned about linguistics, I never would have set out on the course of study and experimentation that has brought me before you today.

Problems of Motivation in Junior College Communication Courses¹

B. E. FISHER²

The problems facing the junior college teacher at times seem legion. One which stands foremost in any list made during one's moments of introspection is that the community college welcomes practically all who wish to continue their education past high school. The great diversity of ability would thus amaze many of you more accustomed to a degree of selection that eliminates the lower-ranking applicants. Junior colleges accept them upon the grounds that some value attaches to further education regardless of previous scholastic record or results of tests. The average junior college class, if such a generalization can be justified, contains those qualified for any collegiate institution, those who could enter no other college, and, most numerically prominent, the great middle class, which falls between the two extremes. Our major problem is this extraordinary range of ability.

Closely related to this is the variety in objectives that junior college students have. We teach those who will be plumbers, stenographers, and radio repairmen, as well as those who will be doctors and lawyers. Often many students combine a technical course of study with their work in the liberal arts. Because the time

spent in the latter courses is often considered an extra frill, the vocational student poses a special kind of problem in motivation. To add to this list of difficulties, the junior college frequently enrolls those who fear the largeness of a university. Their first two college years are spent in a shelter, as it were, before they venture forth into a more stormy existence. And there are those who did not do so well during their high school term. Rather unwillingly do they spend time with us, hoping to qualify for transfer, "to get out," as they so bluntly put it.

We could segregate these people into vocational and college sections. Our policy at Santa Monica City College is to accept the majority as ready for English 1A, the course which carries transfer credit, only the lowest fifth or quarter being placed in remedial sections. Some schools in southern California find even segregation of this sort unnecessary, and their results are fully as good as ours. A majority of junior college instructors look upon these problems of diversity in interest and ability, regardless of the system used in dealing with them, as worth the effort demanded.

A further obstacle is the one of class size. Many junior college classes in communication have enrollments averaging above forty, a number which unfortun-

¹ A paper read at a CCCC session at the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the NCTE, Cincinnati, November 23, 1951.

² Santa Monica City College

ately makes difficult the extra attention needed for the larger numbers of slow learners. We need to give these people more time, but often it is impossible in practice.

After such pessimism you may well wonder if anything can be done to achieve the results each teacher desires. As Dr. Stanley said two years ago at a meeting of this group, "It is easy for a teacher to think sometimes that his long hours are wasted hours." We face students who read slowly, who write with great and painful effort, and who resist any attempt to rearrange the furniture of their minds. Fortunately most teachers will not readily admit defeat any more than they will boast of phenomenal success.

There are many roads to accomplishing what we desire. Many excellent teachers in junior colleges successfully teach composition or speech courses. On the other hand, others are fully convinced that by combining the study of speech and writing with that of reading and listening, they can achieve better results. They feel that the communication approach offers an advantageous solution of the problems which have been listed, especially as the students recognize what the course has to offer.

In the same respect, the judicious use of certain principles of group dynamics affords us means of making students aware of their need to express their thoughts more effectively. The large classes when split into smaller groups change their attitudes. The individual loses his sense of isolation when he finds others with similar tastes. After a semester of studying with, say, five classmates, of reading their themes and listening to their discussions, he understands them and himself better. Let us assume that this hypothetical student is a fast reader. When he talks over what

he has read, either informally or in panel presentation, he acquires new perspectives. His interpretative explanations benefit him as much as they do his auditors. His opposite in the group, the slow reader, finds himself in what is often a new position, one where he is listened to with respect.

It would be fallacious to pretend this example is always the result; however, in such classes the stultifying atmosphere of class recitation, governed by the teacher's personality, is largely eliminated. As an incidental result, it can be shown that the process is a more democratic one in that the communicative process is carried on in as natural a circumstance as possible. "A democratic society must seek for all people those methods of resolving personal and social problems which most completely and successfully bring their best in knowledge, straight thinking, and creative imagination to bear on these problems."³ A teacher's function in a communication class is to provide the proper atmosphere for this cooperative venture. Thus, despite the large numbers enrolled in class, their varying interests, and the extreme range of abilities, all can show measurable gains. They can learn more if a more nearly ideal situation is provided for them.

Much should be said for devices used to improve communication skills. We are only beginning to perceive applications of certain machines in our teaching. The "magic lanterns" which project student themes can supplement the interchange of those papers in class. Tape recording of student panels improves delivery and forcefulness in speech when the student hears himself. The instructor rarely has to make corrective comments when the group comes in to hear what

³ James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, *Discussion in Human Affairs* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 18.

has been recorded. Each person listens with fascination to these strange sounds coming from the small box.

In conclusion, let it be understood that these topics are but a minor por-

tion of what needs to be said about ways of motivating students. May they be taken as such, with the hope that more adequate surveys can be developed in all branches of the college system!

Building a Usable Spelling List For Classes in Writing

PAUL R. SULLIVAN¹

No error in student composition is more readily recognized and more frequently criticized as flagrantly poor writing than misspelling.

Actually, misspelling is not the worst error in composition, for it can be quickly corrected by an alert reader (if not by a careless student). Barzun considers errors in sentence structure and diction much more serious,² and, certainly, most teachers of composition will find that faulty logic, weak continuity, selection of irrelevant details, and lack of something worth-while to say vitiate a composition's effectiveness more than misspelled words.

But the fact remains that spelling mistakes do immediately give a bad impression of a writer. They are errors which the non-specialist in English can readily observe and criticize with assurance while he will pass over mistakes in the "subtleties" of grammar and sentence structure. Furthermore, first impressions can be lasting. Often they are made the basis for a general evaluation. In view of these facts, it is obvious that the college composition teacher cannot slight spelling in his course, however much he may feel that it should have been taught to stick somewhere earlier in the student's education.

With thoughts something like the

above in mind I began, a number of years ago, to collect from student compositions those words I found most commonly misspelled. Eventually I had a sizeable accumulation of words on which errors recurred year after year. They were made on words like *its*, *receive*, *proceed*, *precede*, *existence*, *tries*, and *truly*. All of them were words in relatively frequent use and words which a college freshman should know even though many do not.

I mimeographed this list after a few years and held my students responsible for these words. Subsequently, however, in conversations with professors from other departments, I discovered that many of them felt that students still submitted papers with poor spelling. To broaden the coverage of my list, I then canvassed my colleagues in other departments requesting a list of about five non-technical words that they found frequently misspelled on papers submitted in their classes.

It was interesting to discover that not all departments could list five words but apparently they had been plagued so frequently with a few words that they received the impression that spelling was terrible.

These reports from the various other departments of the college served to confirm two things: first, my own observations; and second, my suspicion that many of the mistakes about which other

¹ Georgetown University

² Jacques Barzun, *Teacher in America*, p. 47.

professors complained were not apt to occur in the English class.

In confirming my own observations, the mathematics department supplied a list containing the words *angle* and *complement*. Among our readings in the English course, the word *angel* occurred in Lamb's *Child Angel*, Ruskin's *Of Kings' Treasuries*, Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, Byron's *Sennacherib*, and elsewhere. It turns out to be a surprisingly common word. The mathematics department had been getting the spellings I wanted: they had been getting *angels* and *compliments*; I had been getting *angles* and *complements*. The religion professor shared my misery. He also had been getting *angles* from his students instead of *angels*.

The Modern Language department mainly confirmed words I had already observed although one professor did come up with the word *bicycle* as a contribution. The feeling was that every boy should know how to spell this word. Possibly the answer is that we live in the automobile age.

Confirming my suspicion of the inadequacy of a spelling list built functionally from mistakes found only in the English class, the History department's list contained the words *primitive*, *medieval*, *castle*, *tariff*, and *emperor*. Though ordinary enough words, all these are much more likely to occur in association with history studies. Accompanying the History department's list was an assurance that the words listed were very frequently misspelled.

The Economics department concurred with the History department about *tariff* and added *welfare* and *business*. They added a few other words which I did not feel should go on a list of basic words. They seemed too technical; but of them I shall say more at the end of this paper.

Of the other departments, Chemistry

was particularly plagued with misspellings of *dissolve*, *soluble*, and *nickel*; and Geography had trouble with *mountains*, *valleys*, *plains*, and names of some countries. The Religion department had difficulty not only with *angels* but also with *sacrament*, *crucifix*, *penance*, and *sacrilegious*. A few of these latter words might seem rather technical to some readers but they are quite ordinary for the student in a church school, even in the grammar grades.

At any rate I incorporated these words into the spelling list I had already published and gave copies not only to my students but also to my fellow professors. The latter also received a letter asking them to watch at least for misspellings of the words on the list and to mark them. The hope was also expressed (perhaps too idealistically) that other professors would make a deduction for misspellings of these published words.

In keeping with the objective of compiling a list of only the most glaring problem words for college students, the list was confined to what would fit on one page of standard letter-sized mimeographing paper. It must be admitted there was some crowding on the page to include all words felt essential.

A few sentences prefaced the list, drawing to the students' attention that misspellings are usually due either to carelessness or to ignorance, neither desirable in any self-respecting man; but more important was one sentence stating that heavy deductions would be made from all English papers for misspelling any of the words listed.

The last sentence is important, for publishing the list was one thing; making it something more than a matter of interest was another. Sanctions are important in needling a student so that he will learn. He is as human as any one of us.

I experimented with a number of different sanctions in trying to help the

student correct his particular errors. First, I deducted five points for each word misspelled on compositions, and one point on tests and other papers done without opportunity of consulting the list or a dictionary. Words misspelled on compositions were corrected one hundred times each, whereupon the credit which had been deducted was returned. A second technique was to deduct five points, have the words corrected a hundred times, and return one-half of the lost credit. The third technique was to deduct five points for each misspelling and let it go at that.

It is worth noting that the student reaction to these sanctions has differed from class to class. The least effective procedure, however, has been the first in which all credit was returned. Otherwise, some groups have responded more favorably to the second technique of punishment-practice-and-limited-reward, while others seemed to understand only the shock treatment of heavy deductions. Perhaps the best technique will prove to be one which I am currently trying, namely, refusing to accept compositions with misspelling of any of the listed words. Some sterner disciplinarian might automatically fail a composition with misspellings of any of the published words. It seems not unlikely that such rough treatment could accelerate the learning rate enough to give no time for an atmosphere of complaint and antagonism to arise. I am reminded in this connection of the effect of a somewhat similar technique used by one of Samuel Johnson's teachers. Upon being questioned one day how he acquired so accurate a knowledge of Latin, Johnson replied, "My master whipt me very well. Without that, Sir, I should have done nothing."³

Although in many Rhetoric books lists

the one hundred or three hundred hardest words to spell will be found to contain a large number of the words that are likely to be collected as I have described, the mimeographed list compiled from papers of students in one's own particular college has a psychological advantage over the Rhetoric-book counter-type. It impresses the student as being close to his needs. The Rhetoric-book spelling list he can dismiss as something done up by an editor who wanted to sell a book. The mimeographed list collected from the papers of fellow students is genuine; it might even include something from the paper of an elder brother or friends in upper classes. It is important, therefore, that the source of the list be briefly explained in the few prefatory sentences. Furthermore, noting inter-departmental cooperation serves to let the student know that writing correct English is not confined to the Composition class but extends to all subjects.

What success can be claimed for this project is hard to say. It did stimulate interest among professors in other departments. I know that some began marking spelling errors. One of the professors of Economics adopted the practice of deducting five points for misspellings of the published words. Another went so far as to write a chastisement on a student's paper for his carelessness in spelling. A History professor periodically summons the worst spellers into his office and requires them to pass a test of their misspellings on papers and examinations just handed back. One of the professors of Religion hands his students a guide sheet for writing book reports, noting among other things thereon that spelling will be taken into account in grading the paper. Two Chemistry professors and one Mathematics instructor draw attention to misspellings by underlinings, even though they do not make a specific deduction of credit. Perhaps the most

³ James Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, New York, 1917, p. 9.

significant thing about these admittedly few and random reports which have filtered back to me regarding the reactions of other departments to our spelling list is the fact that an atmosphere of cooperation instead of complaint has been created.

The exact effect of this spelling project on our students has not been measured statistically. The papers of some students suggest they will always be immune to such help; but many of those who had spelling difficulties did become concerned and did demonstrate distinct improvement even during one term.

There is room for further work along some such lines as are outlined here. There well could be a somewhat more advanced list than the basic one suggested. This became obvious to me as I

received word lists from our various college departments. I found it necessary to eliminate certain words as too technical for a basic list; and yet these words seemed common enough to the professors of particular subjects to include them as frequently misspelled and frequently used. The Chemistry department pleaded to include *desiccate*, insisting that it was commonly used and commonly misspelled. A Geography professor thought *Czechoslovakia* and *glacier* were quite common and ordinary errors. An Economics professor considered *entrepreneur*, *exponential*, and *oligopoly* as among the six commonest words he found misspelled. Clearly there is work ahead. If a limited technical list would help our students in their specialties, it would be worth collecting.

Teaching Exposition: A Method

HOWARD GREEN¹

The college student, as we all know from experience, usually soon forgets whatever he learns in his freshman or sophomore exposition course, and when later, as a junior, senior, or graduate student, he has to write a piece of expository prose, he appears never to have been trained in exposition at all.

Why should this shortcoming be so common, and how can we eliminate it?

In the first place, most college exposition courses are handicapped from the outset by being required; the drawback is apparently inevitable, but compulsion is not the best motive for learning. In the second place, there is a difficulty inherent in the subject-matter: exposition, with however much concrete illustration it may be taught, is essentially a matter of abstract method, and abstract methods are hard to teach and hard to learn. And, in the third place, good exposition de-

mands good analytical thinking, a difficult task for modern college students, not because they are less able than their predecessors, but because they receive no training in even the most elementary kind of logic.

If we can cure this last weakness, at least to some extent, by coaching students in some simple logical analysis, I believe we shall also be in a fair way to dispose of the two other shortcomings. The conscious or unconscious resistance to the "requirement" will be broken down as the student experiences the pleasure of learning to think clearly where before he could only grope; and the ability to think clearly will lessen his difficulties with the abstract material by enabling him to organize it methodically. And this is important. For it is precisely his inability to find a logical structure for the material of his exposition course that is responsible for the extraordinary speed

¹ Vassar College

and thoroughness with which he manages to forget it. We are perhaps to be criticized for not helping him more in this respect.

I would like to suggest a method which will provide a workable structure for teaching exposition and which will help train the student to think analytically (and hence write lucidly). This method is really nothing more than a combination of two old devices, but it is simple and effective. What it is may best be seen by following through an example of its use.

Before the student can begin to write any kind of expository paper, he must be able to organize his subject-matter properly, to divide it into its various parts, and to limit its scope according to the length of his paper. Without this preliminary organization he will ramble, separating topics which should be combined, combining topics which should be separated, and introducing topics which should not be considered at all. Most text-books, of course, do have sections on "Organizing the Topic" or "Limiting the Subject," but they usually suggest common-sense or trial-and-error procedures. What the student needs, I think, is a systematic method of "processing" his subject-matter, and such a method, to which he can be introduced at the beginning of the course, is available in Aristotle's theory of causation. This proposal sounds more forbidding than it really is: a class of freshmen or sophomores can grasp the principles involved after one or two hours of class discussion, during which some illustrations are worked out on the blackboard. Aristotle's analysis of causation is well known, but it will be convenient to summarize it in outlining its present application.

Let us suppose that a student is interested in photography and wants to write a paper on cameras.

Now, according to Aristotle, any effect

(object or event) has four causes: a material cause, a formal cause, an efficient cause, and a final cause. The *material cause*, as its name implies, is simply the material out of which the object is made: in this case, the lens, the case, the film-carrier, etc. The *formal cause* is that which gives a thing its form (the idea or pattern according to which it is made, as the idea in the sculptor's mind gives form to the marble): here, the formal cause will be the design of the camera, or the way in which the various parts are placed in relationship to each other. We can always trace the formal cause back to a set of basic principles; how far we wish to go depends on our purpose. So although we may say that the formal cause of a statue is its idea in the sculptor's mind, the idea itself may be derived from his notion of beauty, and that in turn from his theory of esthetics. Thus, in our example, the student may follow the formal cause back to the laws of optics. The *efficient cause* is that which immediately produces the effect: here, the process of manufacture, or the manufacturer himself. The *final cause* is the end for which something exists, or what we usually call purpose: in this instance, taking pictures.

Having thus analyzed his subject, the student is well prepared to write a good expository paper. His general topic has been reduced to four sub-topics; he may choose one or more of these as the length and scope of his paper permit; and he should be in no danger of introducing irrelevant material. If, at this point, he is still not sure what to include and what to omit, he can guide himself by taking the analysis a step further, that is, by similarly dividing his sub-topic into even smaller units.

He may, for example, decide to write on the material cause of cameras (lens, case, shutter, film-carrier, etc.), and he will perhaps choose to discuss one of

these items in detail (say, the lens) rather than all superficially. Subdividing this more restricted topic as before, he has:

Material cause: Optical glass

Formal cause: Principles of manufacturing optical glass

Efficient cause: Lens grinding

Final cause: Production of a lens which will give an accurate image

"Grinding a Camera Lens" might be the final topic.

For organizing subject-matter, this kind of analysis (which can be done in a few minutes when one has the trick of it) is of more use than hours of unorganized groping; and it allows the writer, in addition, to discover what particular aspect of the topic he is most interested in or most qualified to discuss.

Suppose for the moment that the writer is a man who is experienced in his field and wishes to write a comprehensive book on cameras. His problem now

is not to limit his subject-matter, but to expand it so as to cover the entire field. The same method allows him to do this systematically and coherently. For note that a change in the final cause entails changes in one or more of the others. We saw that the final cause, or purpose, of the camera was to take pictures. But pictures are of many kinds—press photos, portraits, candid shots, microphotographs, and so on—and the formal cause, or design, of a press camera is very different from that of a candid camera. The writer might decide, then, to consider each type of camera in a separate chapter; concerned with the purpose of each type, he would be obliged also to reflect on the three other causes; and, although he might not wish to treat them all (the manufacture of cameras, for example, might be beyond his scope), there would be no danger of his overlooking an important topic.

The method is equally effective for the analysis of more abstract subjects. Here are two examples:

	POETRY	EDUCATION
<i>Material cause:</i>	Words, human experience	Students, books, etc.
<i>Formal cause:</i>	Principles of style (diction, metrics, etc.)	Curricula, theories of education
<i>Efficient cause:</i>	Poets	Teachers
<i>Final cause:</i>	Esthetically valuable interpretation of experience	Wisdom, professional training, social prestige, etc.

These are simply suggested analyses, of course; they are not complete, and, given different points of view, could be altered.

To return to our original example: after the student has analyzed his subject-matter, he is ready for the second step. He has to choose the expository technique most suited to his topic. Is there any methodical way of making

this choice? Several might be devised, but there is one which is easy to learn and almost impossible to forget.

With his topic in mind, the student asks the basic questions: What? How? Who? Why? When? Where? How much, how good, etc.? Using these questions, he can review systematically and rapidly all the available expository techniques, for they can be classified as follows:

QUESTION ASKED OF SUBJECT²: BEST ANSWERED BY ESSAY OF:

<i>What?</i>	Definition
	Description
	Formal analysis (i.e., partition & classification)
<i>How?</i>	Directions
	Instructions
	Basic principle
	Process
<i>Who?</i>	Biography
<i>Why?</i>	Purpose
	Cause-and-effect
	Prediction
<i>When?</i>	Chronology
	Development
	Narration
<i>Where?</i>	Distribution (e.g. geographical, social, etc.)
<i>How much, how good, etc.?</i>	Requirements or standards
	Quantitative analysis
	Argumentation

It will now be easy to choose the most fitting expository method: "Grinding a Camera Lens" obviously calls for one of the techniques listed under the heading *How?*—a set of directions or instructions, an essay of basic principle, or an essay of process. If the student is doing a paper of larger scope (perhaps a dissertation)

which, in its various parts, demands a variety of expository methods, this classification provides him with an inclusive review of all the methods available.

Since an exposition course is designed to train the student in these techniques, he will obviously not be in the position to make an independent choice among them until the course is over, especially since he will probably be assigned particular types of essay from week to week. But if this classification is outlined for the student at the beginning of the course, he will be able to keep his bearings throughout and will be constantly aware that the various techniques are logically related to each other. In this way we can eliminate the particular defect in the teaching of exposition

² When the student has grasped the principle of analysis by causation, his attention should be drawn to the fact that he can also use these seven questions to analyze his subject-matter, for the first four (*What? How? Who? Why?*) correspond to Aristotle's four causes, and the last three (*When? Where? How much, how good, etc.?*) complement Aristotle's scheme, which does not provide for considerations of time, place, or value. But it would also be possible for the instructor to start with the seven questions as a method of subject-analysis and then, by discussing Aristotle's scheme, to show the class what wide implications are contained in the first four.

courses which, I feel, largely accounts for their being so quickly forgotten; namely, that however well they are otherwise taught, their organization tends to be atomic—now one type of essay is taken up and now another, but there is no inclusive structure and hence no real sense of continuity.

These two devices—subject-analysis by Aristotle's four causes and technique analysis by the seven basic questions—provide in combination a useful structure for the exposition course; it is one

which has the merit of flexibility, for it is adaptable to whatever textbook the instructor prefers to use. And this structure has one thing in particular to recommend it. It develops in the student an ability to think independently, to perceive unaided hitherto unsuspected relationships between the various parts of his material; and the acquisition of this ability gives him that sense of excitement in intellectual discovery which any course, whatever its subject-matter, must impart if it is to be successful.

A Device For Teaching Diction

RALPH EBERLY¹

"Wake your readers up," I harangued my fledgling writers; "use words that pry open their eyes and ears and minds."

But Jones stared dully out the window, Brown drowsed, and Popoff snored a boogie accompaniment to the lecture. Twenty other students seemed relatively animate, it is true; yet the recitation on "Exercises Illustrating the Principles of Good Diction" fell somewhat below Shakespearean heights.

After that class-period I visited the library in search of sharper weapons. First I put on reserve three copies of a story anthology (Blodgett's *The Story Survey*). Then, after selecting a brief, vividly written paragraph near the climax of an exciting story ("Deep Water Man," by Brace), I rewrote the passage as drab as possible and mimeographed the resulting atrocity.

When the class met again, I wrote on the board enough information to enable

the students to find the story. Next I read the tale aloud, stopping just before the selected paragraph. (When the pupils howled at the interruption, I invited them to finish the story at the library.) Now I distributed the mimeographed sheets, challenging the class to bring the mutilated passage to life by supplying effective phrases. After ten minutes the students exchanged papers, read one another's revisions aloud, and criticized them. Finally I read Brace's original paragraph.

The device worked. Some of the revisions compared well with the original; some of the criticisms expressed effectively (in the students' own words) the points that I had struggled to bring alive in the lecture; and the whole class responded to this work on diction as an exciting challenge. Even the delayed-reaction bomb exploded: half the group, including Popoff, went to the library to finish the story.

¹ Purdue University

Secretary's Report No. 8

BEVERLY E. FISHER¹

Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Orchid Room, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Illinois, Thursday, March 12, 1953, 8:00 P.M. Chairman Karl Dykema presiding. Thirty-two officers, members of Executive Committee and Editorial Board present: Allen, Archer, Barnhart, Barrus, Beal, Beauchamp, Bird, Booth, Bowman, Brown, Dykema, Faust, Fisher, Griggs, Hatfield, Hodges, Sister Miriam Joseph, King, Lawson, Leggett, Malmstrom, Mason, Morgan, Nelson, Rice (proxy for Young), Sams, Shoemaker, Turpin, Tuttle, Weingarten, Williams, and Wykoff.

1. Treasurer W. Wilbur Hatfield reported a balance on hand, February 28, 1953, of \$1,216.82. Previous balance, October 31, 1952, \$1,055.24; income, \$893.38; expenses, \$731.80. Memberships: Institutional-sustaining, 36; Individual, 285; Library, 15.

2. Chairman Karl W. Dykema reported on his investigation of the possibility of regional meetings (see Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Boston, November 27, 1952, Item 8). A survey of seven other colleges near Youngstown College showed interest in meeting April 11th, although the four-month interval of time is insufficient for adequate preparation. After some discussion of possible joint meetings with other associations, the Chairman asked Executive Committee members to determine possibilities for regional meetings in their areas.

3. Secretary Beverly E. Fisher reported that the Job Exchange is now in operation.

4. The Secretary summarized the re-

port of Loyd Douglas on proposed workshops to study instruction in basic subjects (see Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Boston, November 27, 1952, Item 17). Considerable discussion ensued, concerning money needed, subjects to be studied, and the number and status of instructors affected by such a study. It was moved, seconded, and passed that the Chairman inform Mr. Douglas that the Conference on College Composition and Communication is very much interested in an exploratory meeting with members of other associations for the purpose of further discussion of the proposal.

5. Editor George S. Wykoff reported that he had received some welcomed unsolicited manuscripts, and reports of workshops and addresses at CCCC meetings. The editor raised the question of the possible availability of \$1,000.00 a year to finance the publication of four thirty-two-page issues of the *Bulletin*, no action being taken on this matter. It was moved, seconded, and passed that the appointment of Louis Forsdale to the Editorial Board be approved.

6. The Chairman of the Local Committee, Hermann Bowersox, summarized the activities of his committee in selecting the hotel, mailing of programs to schools in the Chicago area, and of arranging for newspaper publicity.

7. Harold B. Allen reported upon presenting to the Executive Council of the Speech Association of America the action of the CCCC Executive Committee to grant associate membership in the CCCC to any paid-up member of the SAA, upon payment of current CCCC dues. The SAA Executive Council unanimously approved the proposal. It was moved, seconded, and passed that the

¹ Santa Monica City College

Chairman be directed to submit a mail ballot to members of the CCCC, amending Article II, Section 2, of the Constitution to provide for such associate memberships.

8. Donald Bird introduced two proposals: 1) to work out an affiliation with the National Society for the Study of Communication, the liaison to be achieved by having one person as a member of each group's executive committee; 2) to provide membership at reduced rate to persons belonging to either the CCCC or the NSSC. It was moved, seconded, and passed that the CCCC appoint a liaison representative to work with the NSSC in whatever way is necessary, the arrangement to be permanent. No action was taken on the second proposal.

9. Plans for the 1954 Spring Meeting, March 4-6, 1954, in St. Louis, were discussed. Chicago was selected for the 1955 Spring Meeting; and the chairman appointed Irwin Griggs, Richard S. Beal, and Francis Shoemaker to investigate the possibilities of Philadelphia, Boston, and New York, respectively, for the 1956 Spring Meeting. One person remains to be appointed for investigating the possibilities of Pittsburgh for the same purpose. It was passed that the length of the Spring Meeting be extended to two full days (see Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Boston, November 27, 1952, Item 3).

10. Chairman Dykema proposed that

an amendment to Article IV, Section 2, of the Constitution be sent to members, providing for a Nominating Committee to consist of the last three Chairmen and two others to be appointed by the present Chairman from among members of the CCCC who are not members of the Executive Committee. The Chairman of the Nominating Committee is to be the senior past Chairman of the CCCC on that Committee.

11. The Chairman also proposed an amendment to Article III, Section 2, that the newly-elected chairman, associate chairman, and assistant chairman take office thirty days after the Business Meeting at which they are elected. It was approved that the Chairman be empowered to present these amendments to CCCC members by means of a mail ballot.

12. Irwin Griggs presented comments of his committee about the proposed national survey of the professional status of instructors in composition/communication courses (see Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Boston, November 27, 1952, Item 16). After considerable discussion of various aspects of this study, it was moved, seconded, and passed that the Chairman instruct Mr. Griggs to continue in the committee's study and to report to the Chairman as to procedures to be followed.

13. The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 A.M.

Proposed Amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws

At the meeting of the CCCC Executive Committee in Chicago on March 12, 1953, it was voted to submit three amendments to the CCCC Constitution and

one amendment to the By-Laws. The Chairman was directed to draft the amendments and submit them to the membership for a mail ballot in Septem-

ber. The first amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

Article II, Section 2. Individual membership is open to any member of the NCTE or of the Speech Association of America who is interested in any phase or area of college composition and communication.

The section it would replace now reads as follows:

Article II, Section 2. Individual membership is open to any member of the NCTE who is interested in any phase or area of college composition and communication.

The purpose of the amendment is obvious. At its Boston meeting at Thanksgiving, 1952, the Executive Council of the NCTE authorized the CCCC to accept SAA members for CCCC membership.

The second amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

Article III, Section 2. The Chairman, the Associate Chairman, and the Assistant Chairman shall each hold office for one year, beginning thirty days after their election.

The section it would replace is the same, except for the words, "beginning thirty days after their election." The present statement appears somewhat ambiguous; the addition is made to have it conform to Article III, Section 3, in which it is stated that the Secretary's term begins thirty days after his election.

The third amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

Article IV, Section 2. a. The Nominating Committee shall consist of five members; three of them shall be the last three chairmen of the CCCC; two of them shall be appointed by the chairman of the CCCC from among the members who do not belong to the Executive Committee.

b. The chairman of the Nominating Committee shall be the senior past chairman of the CCCC on that committee.

The section it would replace now reads as follows:

Article IV, Section 2. a. The Nominating Committee shall consist of five members nominated from the floor and elected at the annual business meeting.

b. At least three members shall be chosen from the Executive Committee.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide a nominating committee which will be well acquainted with the CCCC membership and the problems the organization faces. On the committee proposed in the amendment, three of the members would have had the experience of preparing a CCCC spring program, and there is no better way of getting to know about the people in the organization. The other two members would be appointed by the CCCC chairman, who would presumably be most aware of the immediate problems of the organization; these two members would always guarantee a voice for the general membership. There would also be a degree of continuity in the committee, since two members would carry over into the committee of the following year. This amendment also contemplates making more use of Article VII, Section 5, the election of officers and members of the Executive Committee by mail, since it is believed that a mail ballot election is much more likely to reflect accurately the will of the majority of the membership.

The amendment to the By-Laws reads as follows:

Section 6. *Rules of Order.* The rules contained in Sturgis's *Standard Guide to Parliamentary Procedure* shall govern the organization in all cases to which they

are applicable, and in which they are not inconsistent with the By-Laws of the CCCC.

The section it would replace, Section 6, now specifies Roberts' *Rules of Order*, Revised. The recommendation for submitting this amendment to the membership was made unanimously at the CCCC Executive Committee meeting in Boston, November 27, 1952 (See Secretary's Report No. 6, Item 13), to bring us into conformity with the practice of the N.C.T.E.

Article IX, Section 1 of the Constitution and Article 7 of the By-Laws provide that a previous notice of a proposal for amendments must be made (a) at the preceding meeting, or (b) by mail or in the official periodical at least thirty days prior to the submission of the ballot.

The material printed above constitutes the official notice of a proposal to amend the Constitution and By-Laws.

KARL W. DYKEMA
Chairman, 1953

Some of the Year's Work in College Composition and Communication

In addition to various articles on composition and/or communication published in *College English*, that magazine has also summarized, from time to time, articles in these fields appearing in various other magazines. It is not the purpose to summarize these same articles here; instead, it is the purpose to summarize materials from some of the periodicals which may not be too easily accessible. For assistance in preparing these summaries, grateful acknowledgment is made to Donald Bird, Stephens College; Harold B. Allen, University of Minnesota; and Ralph D. Eberly, Purdue University. A few have been quoted, also, from various numbers of *The Speech Teacher*.

The Journalism Quarterly, published by the Association for Education in Journalism, is a magazine "devoted to research studies in the field of mass communications." Each issue contains two bibliographical sections, "Articles on Mass Communications in American Magazines—a Selected Annotated Bibliogra-

phy," and "A Selected Bibliography from Foreign Journals" on the same general subject. Among the bibliographical divisions are such headings as Community Newspaper, Criticism and Defense of the Press, Editorial Methods and Writing, Newspaper Production and Management, Public Opinion and Propaganda, Radio and Television, and Survey Techniques and Media Analysis.

"A Small College Declares War on Bonehead Grammar," by Leland Miles (*School and Society*, March 7, 1953) describes the background and final acceptance of a "Faculty Policy on Fundamental English" at Hanover College (Indiana), in order to help make permanent among students the habits of acceptable writing. The policy includes: (1) enrolling poorly prepared entering students in a special five-day-a-week class for three hours' credit; (2) encouraging all faculty members to call attention to fundamental errors in English and to invoke penalties at their discretion; (3) requiring a satisfactory grade

on an English competence test at the end of the sophomore year; passing this test is a requirement for graduation. This policy went into effect in September, 1952.

Too meaty to summarize adequately, the March, 1952, issue of *Education* is a "Communication Skills Number," which was edited by Herbert Hackett, Michigan State College. Its contents are:

"Introduction by the Editor."

"Toward a Philosophy of Communication," Frederic Reeve, Michigan State College.

"What Can the High Schools Reasonably Be Expected to Accomplish in the Skills of Communication?" by John C. Gerber, State University of Iowa.

"The What, When, Where, How of the Communication Arts," Edna L. Sterling, Seattle Public Schools.

"Representative Research in the Communication Skills," Oscar M. Haugh, University of Kansas.

"Critical Listening and the Educational Process," Arthur Heilman, University of Oklahoma.

"A Professional Attitude for Teachers of Communication," Porter G. Perrin, University of Washington.

"Education, Freedom, and the 'Yes' Technique," Lt. Robert Wright, USNR, U. S. Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Maryland.

"'Communication' vs. 'Composition'," Barriss Mills, Purdue University.

Louis B. Salomon, "Whose Good English?" (*American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Autumn, 1952) raises the question of "usable statistics" vs. "value judgments," i.e., of whether certain words or expressions in common use (nearly everybody's use) are therefore desirable. Or, in the author's words: "I just want to point out the danger of falling into the big scientific fallacy of

our time: the fallacy of believing that the scientist's sole responsibility lies in amassing factual information . . . An even more dangerous temptation is to confuse the findings of pure scientific research with standards of value, a confusion leading to the doctrine that whatever is is right . . . I feel that the linguistics people tread on shaky ground when they translate their statistical findings into value judgments . . . My point is that majority usage is no less subject to improvement in phrasing than in the choice of soap, beer, or Congressmen . . . The evidence on which linguistic analysis operates comprises nothing less than the entire body of written and spoken communication during the time under study. Even if you limit your research to documents, you have to decide arbitrarily which ones you're going to accept as truly representative, since people have a variety of reasons for writing with tongue in cheek, affecting locutions either more stilted or more folksy than their natural idiom. But even if sampling procedures could be positively relied on, I don't accept the thesis that majority usage constitutes rightness. Language is so vital a function that it calls for the ministrations of experts, not merely to graph its vagaries but to work actively for the maintenance of highest efficiency . . . What I'm arguing is not that any grammatical forms should be retained for their own sake or because they had a currency some time in the past, but only that our grammarians should continue to exert such pressure as they can in favor of forms they consider useful and against whatever is shoddy or fuzzy, no matter how many millions of satisfied users may acclaim it."

A book—perhaps *the* book—of 1952 which is causing considerable oral and written discussion in composition and communication circles is Charles C.

Fries' *The Structure of English*. Five representative reviews giving different points of view are the following:

Karl Dykema, "Progress in Grammar." *College English*, November, 1952.

Robert C. Pooley, "Grammar in a New Key," *American Speech*, February, 1953.

Donald J. Lloyd, "Hic Jacet: Grammar," *The CEA Critic*, March, 1953.

Harry R. Warfel, "Who Killed Grammar?" in *The CEA Critic*, March, 1953.

Paul Roberts, "Two Kinds of Grammar," *The CEA Critic*, March, 1953.

Paul Roberts, "Pronominal 'This': a Quantitative Analysis," *American Speech*, October, 1952.

If a writer of handbooks is not to follow previous writers of handbooks or give only his own impressions and intuitions, he will write a "handbook intended as an accurate report of Standard English and based on study and investigation." One crucial problem is "whose English?" will be reported upon as "Standard English," and, this decided, a second crucial problem is ascertaining what that English is. The only satisfactory answer is that this hypothetical handbook writer *count*. Roberts illustrates with the pronoun *this*, with data drawn from the nonfiction in nationally circulated "slick" and "quality" magazines (six issues). A tentative handbook rule might be phrased: "The pronoun *this* should not be used with vague reference." Of 296 occurrences, 75 adhere to the rule; 195 break the rule; to 26 the rule does not apply. "Counting . . . will not solve all problems, not even all handbook problems. But it will solve many, and it does seem absurd to argue what the facts may be when it is possible to know what the facts are. If we were indeed writing a handbook of English usage and if we set down the information that in the national magazines pronominal *this* is generally used without a sub-

stantive antecedent, our readers might disapprove of our choice of standard, but they could not disagree with what we say about the standard. That is fact."

The December, 1952, issue of the *Bulletin of the Kansas Association of Teachers of English* contains one long article, "How the K. U. Student Learns English," by members of the Department of English at the University of Kansas.¹

To determine the kind and amount of training each student should have, various tests are administered during Orientation Week, including a reading test and a comprehensive test in English. The freshman English courses taken are English 1a or English 1 and English 2.

English 1a and English 1 have one aim: "to help the student learn to organize his ideas clearly and express them correctly, in the language actually used by educated Americans in the mid-twentieth century"—taking into account also the nature of the subject and the audience. English 1a (for the poorly prepared student) and English 1 use the

¹ The article is reprinted in the Winter Issue, February, 1953, of the *University of Kansas Bulletin of Education*. Oscar M. Haugh, editor of this magazine, writes: "Workshop 12, at the CCCC meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, last spring, discussed the difficulty of circulating articulation material among high schools because of the expense involved The idea that we used is that the program in English at the University of Kansas could be explained to the high schools of the area we serve by using existing publication media. The article was first prepared by a committee from our English department for the *Bulletin of the Kansas Association of Teachers of English* in December, 1952. Since this publication circulated among only five hundred English teachers in the state, we arranged for its republication in the *University of Kansas Bulletin of Education*, which is sent to all the schools in Kansas and to many others in adjoining states which send students to our university.

"The interesting feature of this venture is that this material will reach a total of over four thousand schools and individuals without requiring any special financial subsidy. We feel that using existing publication media is a possible solution to the problem—at least it worked for us in this instance since both publications were easily convinced that articulating high school and college English is vitally important."

same texts, cover the same content, give three credits, provide for frequent personal conferences, and prepare for English 2; but English 1a meets six hours a week, two of them in a "laboratory session" where additional writing, reading, and laboratory-manual exercises are done under close supervision. In English 1a sections are limited to fifteen students; 38 separate compositions totaling 13,000 words are written, carefully read and criticized, and returned for correction and revision. The English 1 classes are limited to twenty students; 23 themes from 150 to 1500 words are required, totaling 8,500 words—carefully corrected, revised, and checked again. Textbooks for 1a and 1 are a handbook of grammar and rhetoric, a reader of non-fiction selections, a modern American novel, and a college dictionary.

English 2 (second semester, freshman year) is American literature. The upper five percent of entering freshmen skip English 1 and begin their college English work with this course; the other students are from English 1a or 1. There are ten papers, ranging from 350 words to 750 words.

English 3 (four great works of English literature) and English 4 (the Bible and Greek epic and tragedy) are two-hour-a-week sophomore courses, including four 350-word class papers, and one of 1,000, one of 2,000 words outside class. Class size is twenty-two to twenty-five students.

For superior students (judged by work in previous courses) there are special honor sections of English 2, 3, and 4; some of the students, if they desire, may omit English 3 and 4 and take English 12 and 14, a two-semester survey of the history of English literature.

Every member of the Department, regardless of rank, teaches these freshman and sophomore courses. Classes of the less experienced are visited, and fre-

quent conferences with and meetings of staff members are held.

An English Proficiency Examination—a requisite for graduation—is given in the junior or senior year; it is a three-hour written paper. Students who fail this examination for the second time must enroll in another composition course.

The Department of English and the School of Education cooperate in training teachers of English. The School of Education directs the Language Arts Major (for prospective teachers in junior and senior high schools) and the English-Education Program (graduate training for prospective teachers of high-school and junior-college English). The Department of English grants graduate degrees in English (M.A. and Ph.D.) leading chiefly to college teaching. A seminar in the teaching of college English is required of those who are graduate students employed as instructors, and a number of those not so employed also take this course.

Recognizing that so-called Standard English is not identical the country over—in usage, pronunciation, vocabulary, morphology, and syntax, Albert H. Marckwardt calls attention to the authoritative data concerning standard English as it is being collected and published in the regional linguistic atlases. "There is no question that these materials, even in their present incomplete state, present a more complete body of carefully gathered information concerning pronunciation than the most authoritative dictionaries are based on today . . . My purpose here is to suggest that since so many of us are concerned with the teaching of the English language on a practical level, the work of the linguistic geographer is by no means merely a remote endeavor, presenting a few research scholars with an opportunity to demonstrate their virtuosity, but rather

an activity that can touch intimately and affect profoundly our everyday classroom practices." ("Linguistic Geography and Freshman English," *The CEA Critic*, January, 1952.)

"What is College Freshman English in Virginia?" by R. C. Simonini, Jr. (*The Virginia English Bulletin*, March, 1953) is a study of first-year English programs in twenty-one Virginia colleges, made for two purposes: to help high school teachers of English better prepare college-bound students and to co-ordinate more effectively the English programs of secondary schools and colleges in that State.

In two-thirds of the Virginia colleges the freshman course covers grammar, composition and literature ("grammar" is interpreted to mean also mechanics, punctuation, and diction, with the approach varying from "formal" to "modern"; "composition" seeks correctness and effectiveness of written expression; "literature" is studied either by types or with emphasis on either modern or world literature). Some speech work is beginning to be included. Four colleges offer the "communication" type of course. Fourteen colleges give placement tests to entering freshmen, and others use entering credentials and theme-placement—in order to section students according to preparation.

The Virginia colleges are seriously concerned about the general deficiency in written expression among entering freshmen, recommend more writing by high school students, and yet are sympathetically aware of "the inordinately heavy teaching and extracurricular load borne by (high school) English teachers." The colleges are also concerned about the deficiencies of entering freshmen in reading facility and comprehension. They are also sharply divided on the teaching of grammar, doubting that

drill in formal grammar helps to develop correct and effective writing and speaking skills but believing that grammar should be a proper motivational and logical means toward forming habits of appropriate usage based on an understanding of the living language.

The study concludes with brief summaries—one for each college—giving the general content of the freshman English courses offered.

In "Composition and Logic" (*The Journal of General Education*, July, 1952), Henry W. Sams discusses the place of formal logic in the teaching of composition.

Since an unstable truce obtains among teachers of English—their conflicting opinions about the purpose of writing, for example, exist in precarious equilibrium—a suggestion that formal logic be stressed in composition courses would probably arouse tempestuous opposition. Even the teacher who regards composition as both the development and the transference of thought might object to the proposal, lest it disrupt the truce.

Yet most composition instructors already emphasize one area of study wherein formal logic might prove fruitful. Good paragraph construction demands relevance between secondary ideas and the main thought, and relevance is the concern of logic. Although the essay as a whole characteristically presents attitudes (to which logical processes are inapplicable), yet paragraphs and sections often make propositions (for which logical analysis is valid); hence logic may be highly appropriate to the writing of these major parts of the essay.

Because the writer's medium is language, the teacher of composition need present only traditional, verbal logic; and he need give only enough to clarify

methods of paragraph development. Exemplification, for instance, may be clarified by the study of induction, definition by the study of the nature of categories, cause-and-effect by the study of conditional propositions, and comparison-and-contrast by a systematic and extensive study of metaphor and related matters. "Certainly the teacher who wishes to assist his students in the moments of arrest, consolidation, and clarification, which at best their writing provides for them, will need the terms of logic. And it is to be hoped that he will use them, not as rigid, antiquated formulas, but with the flexible inventiveness of professional understanding." (RALPH D. EBERLY)

Lee, Irving J. "General Semantics, 1952," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, February, 1952. General Semantics has come a long way since 1940 when Lee first wrote about it. The principles and methodology of General Semantics, as enunciated by Korzybski, have been widely interpreted and acclaimed as a dynamic approach to the understanding and modification of language behavior. The formulations of General Semantics have been found useful by individuals in the study of the communication process, counselling, human relations, psychotherapy, speech correction, teaching, and theory and criticism. Aspects of the subject have appeared in almost every area of the curriculum in high schools and colleges. However, "some responses to the subject have been less than enthusiastic," and despite wide-spread interest in General Semantics, there are few concrete training-testing programs in operation in schools and colleges. General Semantics will not displace Aristotelian rhetoric in the teaching of speech and English. But it will result in increased emphasis on the techniques of agreement and "increased concern with listening skills for

the prevention of disagreement in discussion." It will provide a new and refreshing approach for the teacher of speech and English who feels the need of testing his present views about the nature and purpose of what he is doing. (DONALD E. BIRD)

Hockmuth, Marie, "Kenneth Burke and the 'New Rhetoric,'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, April, 1952. Quoting extensively from Burke's books, Hockmuth presents and illustrates his rhetorical principles. Burke approaches "the subject of rhetoric through a comprehensive view of art in general" with particular emphasis on literature as a means of communication. The key term in Burke's "New Rhetoric" is *identification*, recognition of the appeal of unconscious anthropological and sociological factors in communication. He analyzes the substance as well as the method of rhetoric, thus contributing greatly to the philosophy of rhetoric. The New Rhetoric draws upon and contributes to the work of anthropologists, ethnologists, individual and social psychologists, presenting a broader concept of rhetoric than is generally held.

Burke deals at length with the problem of human motivation as represented in language form and structure. In applying his critical principles to literary works Burke emphasizes the communicative relationship between writer and reader and in so doing goes beyond conventional patterns of rhetorical criticism.

Burke is difficult to understand. He has developed a whole new system of rhetorical thought with new concepts and new terminology. He understands and respects the long tradition of rhetorical analysis, but he has added to it greatly from his extensive study of anthropology, sociology, history, psychology, and philosophy.

The New Rhetoric is no less challeng-

ing and puzzling to the teacher of composition and communication than is General Semantics. (DONALD E. BIRD)

Henneman, Richard H., "Vision and Audition as Sensory Channels for Communication," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, April, 1952.

Do the eyes or the ears afford the more efficient sensory channel through which to present information? Experimental results of previous studies have been inconclusive; results have depended on the type of material used, method of presentation, comprehension measure used, characteristics of the perceiver, and environmental conditions.

A theoretical comparison of the two senses suggests certain basic differences from which hypotheses for experimental investigation may be formulated. The most valuable features of the auditory sense channel seem to be: (1) flexibility; (2) selective presentation; and (3) "attention-demandingness." The most useful characteristics of the visual channel are: (1) referability; (2) adaptability for presenting relational information; (3) faster rate of presentation; and (4) greater variability of dimensions.

At the University of Virginia a study was made of the relative "attention-demandingness" of messages presented aurally and visually. Short informational paragraphs were presented on slides and tape recordings to three groups of men with multiple-choice tests following. Simultaneously, one group was presented with a visual distracting task which required manual response, and a second group performed a non-visual distracting task involving the manipulation of four knobs in a given sequence. The third or control group had no distracting task.

For the control group visual presentation was superior to auditory presentation, but for both experimental groups

auditory presentation was consistently superior to visual presentation. In other words, for persons engaged in attention-demanding tasks, whether visual or non-visual, information presented aurally is more likely to be noted and remembered than that presented visually. (DONALD E. BIRD)

Greenleaf, Floyd I., "An Exploratory Study of Stage Fright," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, October, 1952.

Wherever speech-making is included in the Freshman English course, the problem of stage fright, or as Greenleaf prefers to call it, "social speech fright," is an important and vexing problem. Any new light shed on the problem by research findings is most welcome.

The current study was carried on in the Communication Skills course at the State University of Iowa. First, a preliminary survey of 384 students was made to find out the distribution of population in terms of the degree of "speech fright," from "none" to "severe." Then, hour-long interviews were conducted with 14 students who reported "severe speech fright." On the basis of the interviews, a situational speech inventory was constructed and administered to 789 students.

Symptoms of speech fright are of three types: evaluational, physiological, and avoidance tendencies. The more severe the speech fright, the more numerous are the symptoms. The most important symptoms are: inability to finish speaking; weak voice; inability to look at audience; tremors of head, hands; feeling that audience is disapproving; inability to produce voice; and excessive perspiration.

In terms of development, speech fright seems to be of two types: that which develops gradually through many previous school experiences; and that

which develops suddenly later in life. From the interviews it was apparent that speech fright tends to restrict an individual's social and vocational activities. (DONALD E. BIRD)

Pulgram, Ernst, "Don't Leave Your Language Alone," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, December, 1952.

Hall, Robert A., Jr., "Don't Meddle Ignorantly With Your Language," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, February, 1953.

The age-old controversy concerning the basis for determining correctness or appropriateness of linguistic usage continues. Pulgram takes issue with the point of view presented by Hall in his book, *Leave Your Language Alone* (Ithaca, 1950), and Hall retorts vigorously.

Pulgram, in attacking Hall's functional approach to usage, supports the somewhat more formal position taken by Birk and Birk in *Understanding and Using English*. Hall, Pulgram states, deviates from an aesthetic as well as a grammatical norm in his point of view and in his own writing. He makes the mistake of assuming that because there is little linguistic sense in what the grammarians prescribe, their prescriptions should be ignored. Hall is propagandistic and prescriptive in his book, lacking defensible bases for answering the simplest question about appropriate usage. He emphasizes democracy, abhors authoritarianism, and assumes that language reform will bring about social reform.

Pulgram's thesis is that today's children should be taught today's best standard of English as approved by society. To use the language well is a skill which must be learned and includes knowledge of how to manipulate the basic tools and techniques. The teacher should teach the students to use appropriate grammar and not encourage them to leave their language alone as Hall recommends.

Hall responds in the February issue by indicating that the title of his book did not tell all and that what he meant is that one should not ignorantly meddle with one's language. He questions the use of the term "aesthetic norm" in a scientific discussion. Appropriateness is a matter of context and social circumstance and not a matter of correctness as defined by authority. Hall states that Pulgram ignored the context of the book in picking out minute details for criticism. His plea is for more extensive application of functional and non-authoritarian principles in the teaching of grammar in high school and college. (DONALD E. BIRD)

Grant, David M., and Joe W. Fitts, Jr., "Communication Courses in 1952," *Journal of Communication*, November, 1952. A study of questionnaires returned from 65 of 220 colleges and universities known to have freshman communication courses, this article provides interesting data concerning the curricular and administrative status of the course, the status of instructors and the area of their graduate work, the variety of textbooks employed, the nature of special help for students, and the extent of individual or staff research in the field of communication. Replies indicate that generally the course is well established but that with both direction and teaching chiefly in the hands of members of the department of English and secondarily in the department of speech there is an obvious need for instructors whose training specifically prepares them for teaching communication. (HAROLD B. ALLEN)

Jenkins, Russell L., "Discussional Procedures in Communication," *Journal of Communication*, November, 1952. To determine the relative effectiveness of two methods of teaching communication each

of four Michigan State College instructors taught two classes, one experimental and the other traditional. The control class was taught with "traditional" lectures, instructor rating of papers and talks, and a general authoritarian atmosphere; the experimental class was taught through discussion, often student-led according to procedures of group dynamics, with no instructor evaluation of student performance, and with a general "permissive" atmosphere. Results indicated that neither method produced significantly greater achievement in communication and knowledge thereof. The inference is drawn that since the group method can be employed without loss of traditional values, it is more desirable because it provides also leadership training, aid in personal adjustment, and maximum student participation. (HAROLD B. ALLEN)

Of articles in 1951 in *The Journal of Communication*, the official magazine of the National Society for the Study of Communication, *The Speech Teacher* in its various issues has published the following summaries:

May, 1951. Max E. Fuller, "The Communications Teacher Asks Some Questions." "The author has formulated a series of questions dealing with the teaching of communications courses as a summary of the problems raised at two recent workshops: The Conference on Composition Courses, held on March 23-24, and a meeting sponsored by the Central States Speech Association on April 14-15. Coming from the experiences of classroom teachers in some forty mid-western institutions, these questions should indicate areas for continued and much-needed research."

May, 1951. "The Most Important Problems of College Courses in Communication." "A summary of the workshop discussions held under the auspices of the

National Society for the Study of Communication at its convention in December, 1950.

"Five general conclusions were reached: (1) thorough investigation and study of the issues involved should precede the adoption of a basic communication course; (2) recognizing the significance and value of courses combining two or more communicative skills, the participants in the discussion favor further experimentation with such courses; (3) administrators and teachers concerned with the development of such a course should consult with speech specialists, educators particularly interested in general studies, and specialists in the use of audio-visual methods and materials; (4) because of the comparative recency of Communication Courses, it is impossible to make any valid judgement regarding the comparative effectiveness of these courses compared with the traditional 'fundamentals' courses; (5) there is a real need for research in the field.

"The balance of the article deals with other questions discussed, including the philosophy behind communication courses, current trends, evaluations, and curricular and administrative arrangements."

May, 1951. Wesley Wiksell, "Communication Courses in Selected Colleges and Universities." "A brief report of the Work of a Committee on Problems of Communication Courses of the Speech Association of America. This committee selected for study representative communication courses in the United States and obtained information regarding them by personal interviews. While there were some similarities in the programs studied, the differences were much more striking, a fact probably explained by the recency of the movement, the lack of any guiding force or central organization, and the lack of a distinctive text-

book or a dominant personality in the field."

In "Testing in the New English Program," *The English Record*, Spring, 1953, by Paul B. Diederich, there are a number of informative and challenging statements: "One of the most important things that can be learned, and brought home to the entire staff of a school or college, from an English testing program is the central importance of *skill in reading* . . . the ability to take apart a typical paragraph or passage . . . and answer some penetrating questions not only on what it means but on what makes it go and what makes it hang together. A long, unspeeded reading comprehension test of this sort is the best predictor of grades in nearly all courses, at all levels up through graduate school, of any measure that the testing movement has yet produced . . . The myth that speed of reading has any direct connection with success in school or college should either be laid to rest or else supported by more definite evidence than I have yet seen . . . Writing is not nearly as good a predictor of success in school or college work as reading comprehension, apparently because teachers of other subjects do not feel justified in penalizing a student very heavily if his examinations and term papers, while sound on facts, are written in horrible English . . . In study after study, no matter what kinds of essays were assigned, nor how carefully they were graded by readers of long experience, the essays have consistently given the worst results of all the (testing) measures that have been tried out . . . The objective scores have consistently proved to be so much better predictors of how well students will write, as judged by able teachers over a long period of time, than the initial essay scores, that I would tend to give them at least two-thirds of the weight in deciding a stu-

dent's placement in English, even under favorable conditions . . . I must warn everyone who has to place students in English sections not to rely on ordinary essay grades for some time to come. They won't be worth the paper they are written on."

Ralph M. Williams, in "Words and Their Ways from School to College" (*The English Leaflet*, March, 1952), charges that the elementary school method of teaching reading by the "whole-word" or "flash-card" method is valuable for only ten per cent of all children; for the other ninety per cent, it makes no difference or is a harmful method. The phonetic approach or phonic method has many more advantages. The author believes that college students' errors in spelling, their failure to expand vocabulary, and their failure to improve reading techniques, are traceable to their having been taught in elementary school by the "whole-word" method.

The North Carolina English Teacher for October, 1952, has three summaries of panel discussion talks, "Reasonable Expectations in Basic Communication Skills for Entering Freshmen," given as part of the annual English Institute held jointly by the University of North Carolina and Duke University last July 31-August 2. The following are summaries of these summaries:

Lodwig Hartley, in "The Median Freshman: A Survey of His Writing Practices and His Chances of Survival in College English," gives the results of a study of impromptu themes by 793 students entering North Carolina State College in the fall of 1950: spelling errors, 36.1%; sentence structure, 29.5%; grammatical errors, 4.2%; mechanical errors, 16.4%; use of words, 13.8%. Of the median group, the sixth decile of the freshman class, numbering 79, 16.5%

failed or dropped out the first term; 32.9% did not survive the year; little progress was shown by those remaining during the second term, but in the third term the improvement was much greater. The chief conclusion: "in freshman English our own instruction has to begin, for most of our students, with some frankly elementary instruction in spelling and sentence structure. It would be excellent if the high schools could solve these basic problems for us and could send us students who could at least handle the fundamental sentence types and could spell with reasonable accuracy . . . The greatest handicap that the average high school student entering college suffers is his lack of practice in writing."

F. E. Bowman, in "Toward College Preparation: A Workable Writing Program for the High School English Teacher," gives three principles upon which all high school teachers should agree: some writing should be required of all students, the amount increasing rather than decreasing from the tenth through the twelfth grade; very little writing should be required which is not read and graded; whatever the college-preparatory pupil needs is even more essential for the pupil who ends formal schooling with the twelfth grade. The writing should be closely related to required and outside reading and should force the student to relate his reading and his own experience and intellectual development. If half the preparation time (six hours) is used for composition, the following recommendation is made concerning writing: "each pupil in grades ten through twelve will be required each year to submit 27 200-word compositions with the stipulation that at least one composition in grades ten and eleven and two in grade twelve be a minimum of 500 words."

George F. Horner, in "The High

School Teacher's Contribution to Improvement of Reading Skills," asks for stress on meditative reading as the key to true comprehension: "willingness to think about, and over, and through what has been read . . . Call it judicial or critical or thoughtful reading, or what you will, the intent is to prevent aimless, meaningless, or mechanical reading, however paced or speedy. It is not day-dreaming, or fantasy, or appreciation. It calls for analysis, paraphrase, synthesis, particularization, generalization, analogy, and application—all within the narrow limits defined by the piece itself. And above all, it calls for will—the will to think." Students can be persuaded to enjoy this kind of reading, which is genuinely recreative.

"Rutgers Articulation Conferences," *The New Jersey English Leaflet*, October, 1952. At the first conference attended by representatives of the state department and the Freshman English staffs of the Rutgers colleges in Newark and New Brunswick, the difficulties of freshmen in their adjustment to the language needs of college were discussed. The result was a second conference of six Freshman English teachers and one representative from each of six high schools. All agreed that "the main business of work in English, in high school or college, is the development of language skills—in reading, writing, speaking, or listening—rather than the inculcation of grammatical rules or the training of such skills as are required by blank-filling drill exercises . . . that our students' vocabularies are too small and that even the small vocabularies are ill used, that the students read poorly, that they do not write enough, that the blank-filling exercise is an abomination unto good education even though it seems to the overworked teacher a very present help in time of trouble, that special curricula might well

be served by a differentiation of English instruction, and that composition teachers, especially high school composition teachers, are carrying too heavy a student load." With these problems posed, future conferences are planned to attack them, with different teachers at each—six from the Rutgers English staffs and six from different high schools. The successive groups, informed of the previous discussions, will move forward, at the same time that personal and professional friendships between high school and college teachers are being formed—"perhaps the best foundation for the successful articulation of various levels of work."

In "The Reflective Mind in the Making" (*The Speech Teacher*, March, 1952), Dean C. Barnlund presents the framework within which courses in group discussion can be more successfully taught. The four major goals are one or another of the following: the cultivation of scientific attitudes; the development of mental skills (which include ability to recognize and formulate a problem, ability to analyze problem situations, ability to discover and interpret evidence, ability to suggest solutions, ability to judge solutions in terms of social consequences); the improvement of social skills; and the training in effective speaking in group situations. Through examples Barnlund shows that these goals are most successfully achieved when the problems posed lie within the student's experience, touch him rather closely, and cannot be solved by published or second-hand solutions.

"Eliminating the Barriers between Students and Books," by Alma B. Hovey (*Iowa English Bulletin*, April, 1952) describes briefly the Shambaugh Heritage Library, which as part of the new State University of Iowa Library is a "laboratory in which beginning students may

learn to use reference material efficiently and extend their acquaintance with good books." Freshmen are also given a lecture concerning the arrangement of the library and the use of catalogues, indexes, reference works, and the like. When the first research paper is assigned, students are taken on a tour of the library for the purpose of locating the materials they will need.

On the premise that communication "is a social act, involving at least two people, characterized by the sharing of ideas, experiences, and feelings," James H. Platt and Russell L. Jenkins, in "A Class Project in Communication" (*The Speech Teacher*, March, 1953), describe a procedure in a section of Written and Spoken English at Michigan State College. The object was: (1) to emphasize the importance of objectivity in the living situation; (2) to place the students in a situation in which they could become aware of the bases of personal prejudice toward others; and (3) to impress on the students the importance of improving one's personal relations with others in communication through learning to understand the causes of others' behavior. Each student in the class wrote a paper on why he or she did not like a particular student. Then the term project was to become better acquainted with this student and in a revaluation at the end of the term to give (1) a description of the process used to become better acquainted; (2) a description of facts learned about the student; and (3) a truthful evaluation concerning whether or not the student was now liked by the communicator. Although an "outside laboratory" project, it would offer, if an "inside laboratory" were conducted in conjunction with it, the student supplementary help and guidance. The conclusions reached were: (1) The project definitely aided in helping the participating

students to understand the significance of personal prejudice in the communication situation; (2) The project served to motivate the students extensively; (3) The importance of objectivity in human relations was adequately grasped by all but two students; (4) Further, and better controlled, experimental research should be carried out with the use of this project.

Teachers of communication courses will find of especial interest an article by Rupert L. Cortright, "This Speech Age Makes New Demands upon Education," in *The Speech Teacher* for January, 1953. The article, although touching on the need for oral reading and critical evaluational reading as well as skill in reading comprehension and reading speed, is built around the ideas that "The unique demand of this Speech age upon education is that it shall turn out men and women who command a plain and simple directness in oral communication. The need is for speech not as a skill apart, not as just an art; but as the essence of life—a prime essential to man in his effort better to use his environment and himself . . . It is a part of our task to prepare tomorrow's ablest leaders in every profession to speak up with sufficient assurance and confidence to command the respect and support of their fellows . . . Our curriculum, therefore, must alike serve the comparatively few who will rise to stardom on Radio, TV, Stage, Screen or Political Platform and 'All American Youth' whose personal, professional, and social competence and happy adjustment to life will be enriched and more effectively implemented by basic speech training . . . Teaching conversational skill is related . . . Conversation can and should contribute to the greater satisfactions of life, to happiness and peace of mind, and to self-confidence."

In "Why Such Lack of Good Written English among College Students?" (*Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, October, 1952), Dean I. N. Carr of Carson-Newman College has at least two answers:

(1) "Students do not get enough practice in English classes. Instruction in the choice of words, their use and the development of language does, in no sense, replace practice in using it. In some manner, therefore, the subject must be presented in such an effective way that the student can see and believe in its immediate benefits. In my opinion a sense of deep appreciation and feeling for literature is not acquired until and after the student has a fair knowledge and appreciation of the technical structure of the language, or possibly the two may be developed at the same time . . . The whole problem challenges the best thought and planning in the teaching profession."

(2) "There must be a correlation of effort in all departments. The demands of standards required must be equally as strong in other departments as those of the English department. Teachers throughout the college, university, or high school system must place a premium on and require good English. Otherwise the student is likely to get an erroneous impression and come to believe that requirements in English are departmental and, therefore, of less importance in other departments."

In "Report Writing for Industry," in the December, 1952, *Bulletin of the American Business Writing Association*, C. A. Brown of General Motors Institute discusses "the process which is so designed as to bring together both the people who will teach the courses and the people who will use the personnel after training." By definition, a report is "a communication from some one who

has information, to some one who wants to use that information." Readers may be in a technical position, or supervisory, or managerial, but very rarely is any report over three pages long read entirely through by all readers. Influential factors also are the nature of the report, the use to which it may be put, and the writer's position. All these, rather than a rigid textbook classification of reports, determine the content, format, and style of each individual report. The article concludes with a description of six courses in report writing developed at General Motors Institute for different groups of people in or preparing for places in industry: formal technical reports, advanced technical writing, business studies and reports, fifth-year reports (a one-year research project or study in a plant), report writing for industry (refresher courses for graduates of engineering schools), and reports for supervision (i.e., reports by foremen).

William D. Baker, in "The Opaque Projector" (*The Basic College Newsletter*, Michigan State College, January, 1953), discusses the opaque projector as a helpful instructional device—"not something to be toyed with, tried out once or twice or used now and then, but a device to be used flexibly as the changing tone and temper of the class makes its use desirable." Projection of a theme corresponds to the experience of publication, and the "author" has at once a critical and sympathetic audience whose comments on his handwriting and his content-and-expression writing tend to his improvement. With projection, the class can all concentrate on a single copy of the work presented, and as time goes on class-criticism improves, deepens, and matures. When a student reads aloud, with the class seeing the material read, an idea is obtained of a student's oral reading ability; in turn, the class is pro-

vided with an opportunity for listening and for making comments on the quality of the reading. The opaque projector also indirectly helps to teach speaking through creating a special audience situation for informal speaking. In addition to themes, with the machine "all sorts of material can be presented—material which the text or syllabus cannot provide: pictures, graphs, diagrams, cartoons, newspaper clippings, magazine covers and advertisements, or sheets from a workbook."

Using the symbol of a 4,000-year-old Island-of-Cyprus clay ball whose written inscription is unknown, Kermit Rolland in "The Clay Ball—An Object Lesson in Communication" (*Bulletin of the American Business Writing Association*, February, 1953), stresses the fact that "American institutions, including business and industry, must improve their communication with those whom they wish to serve," and that business and industry have found serious faults in these forms of written communication: correspondence, reports, memoranda. Special languages have arisen which people do not understand and to which various names have been given: *insurancese*, *commercialese*, *officialese*, *journalese*, *legalese*, *sciencese*—each having a special vocabulary with meaning only for the initiate. Practitioners have become so attached to these special languages that they are unable to express any idea in a simple precise way but employ instead a pretentious vocabulary and phraseology. The reason suggested is that more people than ever before—people with little or no training or experience are "still being encouraged to write letters and reports for business and industry. The language they use is *commercialese* either because they have learned it in a commercial school or because they have discovered it in the files." Through the

various state insurance laws and the consequent need for specialized meanings, Rolland finds some justification for *insurancesese*; he can find no valid reason for *commercialese*.

In "Publish or Else" (*American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Winter, 1952-53), by Grant H. Redford, the answer as far as teachers of service courses, such as freshman English, are concerned is that their time and energies should not be drained off in unproductive attempts at required publication. Using the University of Washington as an example, he computes the average week of the average teacher of Freshman Composition (three classes three days a week, averaging 25 students; 75 papers a week to be read with all that such reading entails; preparations for classes; conferences with students) as 47 to 52 hours on the job. These do not include general and special reading in connection with assignments of library papers or the hours spent in keeping up with books and journal articles in or related to the field. "After performing this service for the university, only a rare few can possibly have enough time or energy left to even contemplate writing projects of their own."

"Obstacles in the lives of students to the successful teaching of English are many and obvious. Among them are lack of time and favorable surroundings for reading; dependence for information upon radio, television, and a hasty glance at the headlines; declining respect for 'correct English'; unwillingness to work consistently toward self-improvement; and failure to comprehend the rich rewards offered by proficiency in the understanding and use of language. However, those of us who have committed ourselves to laboring in the English field are so completely convinc-

ed of the practical value and esthetic pleasure abounding there that we continually seek ways of making English more desirable and palatable to those who must 'take' it."—Collie Garner, "Grammar and Literature, But Still English," *North Carolina English Teacher*, February, 1952.

"Descriptive Linguistics and the Teaching of English," by Robert A. Hall, Jr., *Education*, February, 1953—originally a paper at the Fifth Annual Conference on Communication at the University of Wisconsin, July 15, 1952—condemns the present content and procedures in teaching "reading and writing in the first grade, up through college instruction in composition"; gives a somewhat detailed definition of "descriptive linguistics"; and outlines the ways in which descriptive linguistics should be used in teaching (1) spelling and reading in the lower grades, (2) analysis of grammatical structure, socially acceptable usage, vocabulary, and punctuation in later elementary school and in high school, and (3) stylistics in later high school—"with little left for college 'freshman English' but remedial work."

Henry L. Wilson, in "Classification and Punctuation of 'For,'" *American Speech*, December, 1952, concludes that *for* "as a conjunction often introduces clauses that modify some part of their primary clause; and it never joins any elements except clauses. These two characteristics are typical of adverbial conjunctions as a class. The same characteristics are found in *since*, *because*, *although*, *while*, *when*, and *if*." As such a conjunction, there is good reason for the comma before *for*, meaning "to show reason."

After literally scores of examples, with discussion, Donald W. Lee, in "Close

Apposition: an Unresolved Pattern" (*American Speech*, December, 1952), concludes: "All in all, the pattern is one natural in English, showing a long history, but, like many others, never completely generalized so that it can be used in all situations, and, also like many others, subtle in its implications and demanding extended analysis in a full description of the language."

In "The Case for Discussion" (*Phi Delta Kappan*, May, 1952), Edward A. Townshend, an educational psychologist, "takes issue with those who recommend discussion methods in all learning situations. Discussion is a technique for the exchange of opinions regarding the known and cannot be used effectually where the aim of communication or instruction goes beyond the known to the unknown." (Quoted from *The Speech Teacher*, November, 1952, page 298.)

The March, 1952, *Bulletin of the Kansas Association of Teachers of English* contains several articles by members of the Department of English at Ottawa University, Kansas. In "Ideas for Creative Writing," Emory J. McKenzie advises using material that students already know well enough to use effectively. In "Reading Improvement at Ottawa University," Nelda Budde outlines a two-hour - each - week non - credit developmental reading course that can be taught in a small college by a member of the department of English: the use of various standardized tests to diagnose weaknesses and indicate progress; the use of textbooks for vocabulary development; the development of speed in reading and of correct reading techniques for various kinds of subject matter; methods and value of skimming; use and value of mechanical devices; and the results that are likely to be obtained. In "Advanced

Freshman English," Lulu M. Brown states that at Ottawa a sixth or seventh of the entering class are enrolled in Advanced Freshman English on the basis of high school transcripts, records in various entrance tests, and a fairly long composition; the course is one in reading and in written and spoken English, and is built around world literature, which furnishes subjects for weekly themes and for the investigative paper as well as for class group discussions.

In "The English Professor and His Natural Enemies," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Winter, 1951-52, Roger P. McCutcheon discusses first the schools of Education, which are enemies on two counts. They have a stranglehold on the machinery by which English teachers are certified; in many states a high school teacher cannot take a master's degree with English as the major subject, for "the major must be in Education, and the real reason for this requirement is to provide a substantial if reluctant class enrollment . . . We (English teachers) have expressed violent opinions, but have actually done nothing." Second, the system of multiple-choice questions on examinations from the grades to the graduate school "has deprived students of the valuable discipline and practice required in answering an essay-type examination. That many students nowadays reach college without ever having written a paragraph or even a complete sentence on an examination paper will seem incredible only to the inexperienced . . . that (multiple-choice-question) overuse has diminished important training in thought and in composition is, I believe, true beyond any doubt."

The Virginia English Bulletin (December, 1952) contains a resolution prepared by the Virginia Association of

Teachers of English, and sent to the Virginia State Board of Education. In the resolution objection is made to the low certification requirements for English teachers in the public schools of the state: 12 semester hours in English for incidental employment, 18 semester hours for regular appointments. To make these requirements more nearly comparable to those in neighboring areas, North Carolina, Maryland, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, the Virginia Association of Teachers of English asks that certification requirements in English in Virginia be a minimum of 24 semester hours. The same issue of *The Virginia English Bulletin* contains a statement by Maxwell H. Goldberg, Executive Secretary of the College English Association, stressing the need for properly qualified English teachers in the secondary schools and putting the CEA organization behind the "common cause" of better English-teacher preparation.

Herbert Hackett in "The Communication Skills Course," in *Speech Activities*, Summer, 1952, presents a generalized definition and two basic problems: the Communication Skills Course, in content, "may be considered an integration of four basic skills, reading, writing, speaking, and listening. This integration is not only a mechanical interplay of these skills as such, but is based on the developing personality of the individual as measured by his ability to communicate with his fellows. What this means is that the skills are no longer taught as if they existed in a vacuum; they are treated as cultural behavior . . .

"Two basic problems face the new discipline. The first of these is the training

of teachers qualified to operate in a much expanded field . . . The second problem is the formation of a new discipline, with an integrated philosophy and a common core based on scholarly research."

The experiment in Paul D. Bauder's "A Freshman English Experiment: General Education in a Traditional Curriculum" (*Junior College Journal*, February, 1952) at St. Petersburg Junior College is "making a substantial portion of the course include readings in the field of general education and some units in the study of current communications media." For lectures and materials, subjects for term papers, and types of writing, other departments have been utilized, such as religion, general science, and speech (for the recording of poems). "College teachers who wish to maintain the traditional approach can take advantage of the existing faculties of the departments of their colleges and garner for their students the values attendant to a general education program."

Nick Aaron Ford, writing on "The Responsibility for Language Usage" in the *Journal of Higher Education* for March, 1952, "registers objections to the tendency of linguists to undermine the standard concepts of sentence structure and punctuation. Instead, it is argued, linguists and phoneticians should be the last to adopt language changes inaugurated by the masses, else language usage must become chaotic and without teachable discipline." (Quoted from *The Speech Teacher*, November, 1952, page 292.)